

1005152204

It is often helpful if activities of this kind can be spotted in advance.

NEW YORK WORLD
TELEGRAM & SUN
New York, New York
January 9, 1959

Tobacco Men Lash Tax Proposal; Bill Gets No Support at Hearing

By DAVID COOPER.

Folks connected with tobacco—enough of 'em to overflow the Highway Building auditorium—yesterday smoked over and verbally chewed up a proposed bill taxing tobacco products.

So strongly did they put their case that at the end of a Joint Finance Committee public hearing on the bill, one of its introducers, Rep. John McLaughlin of Iredell commented:

"My name's on that bill, but that doesn't mean I have to vote for it."

McLaughlin said he had signed the bill, which was estimated to bring in an extra \$14,000,000 in tax revenue, at the request of its other introducer, Rep. J. Thurston Arledge of Polk.

He told those present opposing the bill that he might be wrong in his views and, "I'm more convinced I am wrong after hearing these distinguished gentlemen today."

But McLaughlin did say he considers tobacco a luxury item and that if the State has to find additional revenue, "I'd rather tax a luxury item than food."

The big committee heard from six representatives, several of them former legislators, of tobacco farmers who oppose the measure.

Carl T. Hicks, president of the Tobacco Growers' Information Committee called the bill "unjust." "It discriminates against a single farm commodity with an additional tax," he said.

Hicks said that tobacco taxes in other states have "changed smoking and sales patterns." Tobacco farmers are still trying to recover from the cancer scare of several years ago, he asserted.

Travelers through the State contribute a lot in tobacco revenue, Hicks said, revenue which would be driven into Virginia "where there is no State cigarette or tobacco tax" if the bill passes.

"Travelers quickly learn of areas where nuisance taxes are levied," he remarked.

Three-Cent Tax.

The bill would levy a three-cent tax on each pack of cigarettes and half a cent on cigars weighing less than three pounds.

1005152204 A

RALEIGH NEWS & OBSERVER
Raleigh, North Carolina
April 15, 1959

Skull Urged As Label on Cigaretts

Associated Press.

PIERRE, S. Dak., Jan. 9.—Cigaret packages would be labeled with skull and cross bones under a bill introduced in the South Dakota Legislature yesterday. The grim measure was introduced, in apparent seriousness, by Sen. Don Stransky (D), Chamberlain, S. Dak. hotel man and a smoker.

Sen. Stransky's bill would change the South Dakota cigarette tax-stamp law to read: "The stamp or imprint required herein must be in the form of a skull and crossbones and shall include the words 'the use of this product is not recommended by the state of South Dakota. The use thereof may cause death from cancer or heart disease.'"

Spokesmen for the tobacco industry could not be reached immediately for comment. However, the Tobacco Industry Research Committee maintains that scientists have never linked with lung cancer or heart disease.

DURHAM HERALD
Durham, North Carolina
March 1, 1959

Proposed By Five States

Cancer Labeling Worries Leafmen

WINSTON-SALEM (AP) — Tobacco smokers; and the North bacco growers are becoming alarmed about a growing movement among state legislatures to label tobacco products as cancer-producing agents.

At least five states have introduced such proposals.

South Dakota legislators were the first to consider requiring a skull and crossbones on cigarette packages and a warning that smoking may induce lung cancer.

State, agricultural and some industrial leaders in the South fired messages of complaint to the South Dakota legislators, and some hints of reprisal against South Dakota products. After passing the Senate, the measure was killed in the House.

Utah quickly followed with a similar measure and others have been proposed in the legislatures of Massachusetts, New York and Missouri.

In addition, the Ohio legislature received a House resolution which asks the state public health director to investigate reports relating to deaths from cancer among cig-

arette smokers; and the North Dakota legislature received a bill which would bar radio and television advertising of cigarettes, tobacco and alcoholic beverages in connection with any sports program in the state.

The intent of the legislative proposals, as compiled by the Tobacco Growers Information Committee here:

Massachusetts—Would require labeling of cigarettes to show tar and nicotine content and this inscription: "May induce cancer of the lungs."

New York—Would require a cancer warning label and an inscription saying that cancer occurs more frequently among excessive smokers than among more moderate smokers or among non-smokers.

Missouri — Would require that cigarettes and cigars carry this label: "Constant and excessive smoking may cause lung cancer."

Utah—Would require a skull and cross bones label on tobacco products and this inscription: "Contents of this package contain poisonous ingredients."